

HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVII, No. 4

Thursday, January 28, 1960

Washington, D. C.

News Section

BUDGET: *The spenders in Ike's camp* (page 1)

DEMOCRATS: *Clashes within the party* (page 1)

NEW YORK: *Rockefeller vs. upstate GOP* (page 3)

MacARTHUR: *Salute to a statesman* (page 3)

NUCLEAR TESTS: *Why more are needed* (page 4)

Behind That Budget: The paradox puzzling conservatives across the country is the image of Ike, sincerely squaring off against the inflation menace, but simultaneously asking Congress for the highest peace-time spending appropriations in history—\$79.8 billion.

However, the paradox does not baffle the denizens of Capitol Hill. They recognize that the country has been fooled by the assumption—"Ike got rid of Sherman Adams and can now work for a sound dollar unimpeded." Despite the improvement in the President's attitude after the dismissal of the No. 1 Modern Republican, the fact is that several others of the same general stamp remain in his entourage, to wit:

(1) Secretary of Labor Mitchell, who helped give the wage-price spiral another upward twirl in the steel settlement. No friend of the anti-inflation forces.

(2) Secretary of Interior Seaton, today rejoicing in a Budget award for "reclamation," ironically at a time when the Department of Agriculture takes great tracts of western land out of cultivation. Seaton is an outstanding "empire builder" among the bureaucrats.

(3) Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) Flemming, an arch-bureaucrat schooled under Roosevelt and Truman—also a beneficiary of an increase of \$1.5 billion (over the last Budget) in the current raid on the taxpayers' exchequer. Probably the biggest "empire builder" of them all.

The New York Times (January 19) gave front page space to Flemming's current budgetary triumph, noting that the Flemming voucher request this year rises to \$3,517,000,000; and adding, "If Social Security disbursements from trust funds were added, the total to be paid out this year by the Department [of Health, Education and Welfare] would exceed \$15 billion. Thus, the current results of New Deal legislation are Federal disbursements of human welfare in this country second only to those for national defense." In short, HEW, under New Dealer Flemming, ranks next to the Defense Department in spending the taxpayers' money.

The paradox becomes clear. The General at the top operates through his "chain of command" among the cabinet members. The above-mentioned trio work against such thorough-going anti-inflationists as Anderson (Treasury), Mueller (Commerce), and Summerfield

WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE

(Post Office): In a bureaucratized Executive, the empire-builders are the ones who make time. So, the spending Budget rises to an unprecedented figure, while the word from on high continues to be "fiscal solvency."

Some Congressmen point out how far upward we have travelled in Federal spending, by recalling that in 1957 (when Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey revolted against profligacy) budgetary spending requests were only \$71.8 billion—today they are about \$8 billion more.

Humphrey's rebellion (and his warning, "boom and bust") helped spark a country-wide revolt against Ike's high-spending Budget of that year. This year, it remains to be seen if "sound dollar" organizations founded to fight inflation will marshal a similar revolt of the taxpayers.

Already, many members of Congress of both parties—dubious of Ike's arithmetic of a \$4 billion surplus—heed the admonition of Senator Harry Byrd (D.-Va.) that the only sure way of attaining a balanced Budget and sound dollar is to cut the Budget.

Hence, the Administration's defensive posture of "holding-the-line" on the Budget against the fantastic demands of the wild-spending "liberals" in Congress seems to many on Capitol Hill less likely to succeed than an aggressive "slash the swollen Budget" campaign, rousing the country and welding the Old Coalition of southern conservatives and northern Republicans to ensure fiscal solvency.

Indications that such will be the case are already appearing on the Hill. Congressmen Clarence Cannon (D.-Mo.) and John Taber (R.-N.Y.) announced on January 20 that they are aiming to cut "at least \$2 billion" from the President's Budget, beginning with nearly all of the 42,000 new civilian jobs the President seeks. Cannon and Taber, as chairman and ranking minority member of the House Appropriations Committee, will have great influence in determining the size of the Budget; House Speaker Sam Rayburn once referred to Cannon as "the most powerful man in the House."

Democrats: Reports from all corners of the country indicate to Capital observers that the Democratic donkey is becoming a many-headed beast, with intra-party squabbling rated as an even greater election year danger than a prospective walkout of southern delegates at the national convention.

A case in point is the New York State Democratic death struggle between Carmine DeSapio's Jim Farley-type regular Democrats and the Eleanor Roosevelt-ADA wing attempting to wrest control of the huge 114-vote state delegation to the coming national convention.

The latest "get DeSapio and we'll get the delegation" move by the ADAers is seen in their encouragement of New York City Mayor Robert F. Wagner's grab for a large share of the delegation from DeSapio and State Chairman Michael H. Prendergast. New York observers claim the ADAers realize that they can expect to go to the convention with no more than six district delegates plus a few delegates-at-large, such as Herbert Lehman, and that they will be unable to command more than ten of the 114 votes, the remainder staying with DeSapio (thought to favor Symington) and Prendergast, who are representative of the party statewide.

By encouraging Wagner, a fence sitter between the warring groups who is known in party councils as a political weak sister, the "liberals" reportedly feel they can eventually grab any bloc Wagner may succeed in pulling from DeSapio-Prendergast.

They reason that behind Wagner's new-found vigor lies a desire to increase his chances for Vice Presidential nominee, a spot he admittedly would welcome. Observers claim the "liberals" could appeal to Wagner by hinting at his nomination on a ticket headed by the expected ADA choice, the Reuther-backed Senator Hubert Humphrey. Although not now clearly evident, Reuther influence in New York districts where big labor is strong will be looked for. In any event the New York delegation is expected to be strife-torn on the convention floor, and national party leaders are concerned over growing prospects that this may be the case with other key northern states. Democrats are locked in tougher election year party infighting than at any time since pre-FDR days.

Cuba—What Next? While Castro continues to consolidate his power, Capitol Hill legislators furrow their brows over the ominous spectacle of a Red satellite state (with a missile base, to boot) just 100 miles off the coast of Florida. Castro has no open friends on the Hill, and Senator Smathers (D.-Fla.) let off a blast at the Red dictator last week. Highlights of the situation, as follows:

(1) Most of the regimes in the 20 Latin American republics are opposed to the Castro regime. Some elements and some republics reportedly are willing to help invade Cuba and throw him out.

(2) A Cuban Legion of about 3,000—well-armed and trained—stands ready in the Dominican Republic. President Somoza of Nicaragua is also interested. But such regimes want (a) signs of a unified Cuban Government-in-exile and (b) assurance that the US State Department will not interfere. No signs of (a) and no indication of (b).

(3) Exiles do have—it is reported—one weapon: a radio station, mounted on a vessel, which tours around the island and broadcasts appeals to the Cuban people to overthrow Castro.

(4) The young dictator now stands unmasked as the Mao Tse-tung of the Americas, vowed to spread Red revolution throughout the hemisphere, even if Cuba

is wrecked in the process. His relations with Red China become closer, Moscow continues to play it cozy and let Peiping heap up the bonfire on the US doorstep. (Two and a half years ago HUMAN EVENTS was the first publication to tab Castro as a tool of Moscow.)

(5) The US State Department continues to dilly-dally. After promising American business elements to crack down on Havana, all that resulted was a timid, pusillanimous note to Castro. Some pro-Castro elements are reported among State personnel.

(6) Some of those studying the Cuban imbroglio believe that the day might well be saved without armed intervention by a strong propaganda campaign by radio and infiltration. This, they say, is a job for CIA (the Central Intelligence Agency). CIA reportedly had a hand in the ousting of the other Communist regime which arose in Latin America—the Arbenz regime in Guatemala in 1954. What—it is asked—are they waiting for, now?

(7) One guess is: unless some vigorous steps—as suggested above—are taken, within two months Castro will have become too strong to oust, except by armed intervention on the part of the US. Repercussions on the rest of Latin America from such an extreme move would not be good.

Capitol Camera: Amidst the "liberal" hue and cry that the country isn't spending enough on defense because America is too "soft," Senator Harry Byrd (D.-Va.) has the figures to show that since 1953-54, Federal defense spending has increased only \$700 million in seven fiscal years, while domestic civilian expenses are up from \$19 billion to \$36 billion—with the largest increases being in housing and welfare, fields dear to the hearts of the "liberals"—even though evidence is mounting that these extra Federal funds are a major contributor to America's "softness." Those concerned with fiscal solvency have proposed that if further defense spending is actually necessary, the funds can easily come from the \$17 billion added domestic funds.

● *A third area of greatly increased civilian cost is debt interest—yet congressional spenders are ready to eliminate any possibility of the Budget surplus forecast by the President. But, Capitol Hill notes, even if the expected \$4.2 billion surplus materializes (a slim possibility since it depends partly on new taxes), it will take three years of \$4.2 billion surpluses—three years of a rapidly-expanding economy and the defeat of spending schemes—to make up for the \$12 billion deficit of 1958-59, and bring the national debt back down to \$280 billion, where it stood in 1958.*

● Capitol Hill receives warmly the news that Mrs. Richard Simpson, widow of the late Congressman from Pennsylvania's 18th District, plans to be a candidate for the seat her husband held in the House. Simpson, ranking GOP member of the House Ways and Means Committee when he died, long fought for fiscal solvency and lower taxes, and bitterly opposed Modern Republicanism. Mrs. Simpson declared that she would be delighted to "carry on the principles and philosophies for which Mr. Simpson stood."

Rockefeller: National GOP leaders are showing no little concern over bitterness and poor morale among Republican regulars in New York State. In last November's off-year elections, Republicans lost ground in up-state New York and the reason given most credence is Nelson's indifference to Republicans in filling appointments and his disregard of the GOP state organization. Although he inspires people with his handshake and grin, critics note, he isn't doing right by the party folk who must get out the vote.

Considerable fuel is expected to be added to this political fire during the current session of the Legislature, as Rockefeller plans to push for "liberal" legislation in public housing, health insurance, and anti-discrimination rental laws heretofore considered Democratic pet projects. To succeed, Rocky will need strong support from the Legislature's 81 Democrats who reportedly see the wisdom of backing the man who stole their thunder. To fight Rocky on these issues for partisan reasons would lay them open to "liberal" charges of scuttling New Deal-type legislation. The strongest indication that up-state Republicans are set for a pitched battle with Nelson was State Senate GOP Leader Walter Mahoney's prediction that the Legislature would pass a one-year residence law for public welfare. Mahoney has known, since welfare scandal hearings were held in Albany in February, 1959, that Rocky has little interest in clamping down on welfare chiselers (the corruption-ridden Aid to Dependent Children program costs over \$12 million a month) and that he opposes a residence law.

Observers see a GOP-backed Mahoney challenging a probable Rockefeller veto, should a residency bill pass.

Added to this, proposals to extend anti-bias housing legislation are expected to produce a hard fight, with the Governor lined up with a "liberal" bloc against GOP opposition.

Empire State reports have it that a strong Rockefeller image is emerging—the image of a "Franklin D. Roosevelt in Republican clothing."

80 Years A Patriot: This week marks the 80th birthday of America's first warrior, General Douglas MacArthur, and as the General planned to celebrate quietly in New York with family, friends, and old military associates, friends and admirers across America and throughout Asia were recalling the soldier-statesman's exploits.

With the growth of Red China as a political and military threat to freedom, MacArthur's views on the conduct of the Korean War continually come to mind. Before his dismissal by President Truman, General MacArthur was held back by executive order from bombing Red Chinese railroads and supply convoys north of the Yalu River, which separates Korea and Manchuria. On the shooting side of the Yalu, American airpower had reduced Red supplies to a trickle, those reaching front line troops being run in by coolies. Had MacArthur been allowed to send his bombers into Chinese territory, undoubtedly the war would have been won and countless lives saved.

In answer to a question regarding his firing of MacArthur during a recent speech at Wisconsin University, Harry Truman said: "I was trying to keep the war from spreading. I was trying to confine it. But he [MacArthur] wanted to drop bombs in China."

Observers note that this was Truman's reasoning even after it was obvious the Red Chinese were in the war and contributing heavily in terms of men and material.

According to sources close to the General, MacArthur remains convinced that Chinese Communist bases in Manchuria should have been destroyed, and that by doing this the war would have been won and the growing power of Red China nipped.

Reportedly MacArthur feels that the strong traditional pride of American arms was injured by not fighting Red China through to victory after she caused huge American casualties.

● In answer to a HUMAN EVENTS editor's question at the National Press Club last week, Japanese Prime Minister Kishi stated: "I think the prosperity Japan enjoys today and the good relations between Japan and the United States can be largely attributed to General Douglas MacArthur."

Labor Union Strategy: The labor boss oligarchy last week unsheathed the bludgeon—and a very old, well-worn one—of blackmail. In a campaign of off-the-record statements to the press, Big Labor said it is going to sit on the side lines in the 1960 campaign—no endorsement, no COPE political activity for any Presidential candidate. Most of the press, including some organs usually careful in such matters, swallowed it whole.

Labor experts on Capitol Hill smile, for they recall what happened in the historic campaign of 1948. In the spring of that year, one usually careful labor reporter, Victor Riesel, wrote: "For the first time in 16 years a man can run on the Republican ticket without fear of real opposition from the political machines run by labor chiefs throughout the country The labor leaders are simply not going to campaign for Harry Truman." Jack Kroll, head of the CIO's powerful Political Action Committee, asked in a press interview: "Has it occurred to you that we can sit on our hands in this campaign?"

What happened? By August the Kroll question had become not rhetorical, but ridiculous. Jules Abels, in his careful history of the '48 campaign (*Out of the Jaws of Victory*, Holt, \$4.95), described how the CIO-PAC "had organized a bigger-scale campaign than it had against Dewey in 1944, when the emphasis was more on publicity than on precinct work. Jack Kroll had an army of precinct workers enrolled" in a massive drive to get out the vote for the Democratic ticket. President Truman received a whole flock of labor union leaders who assured him of their support for his re-election. Some labor

STROM THURMOND, United States Senator from South Carolina: "The sound philosophy expressed in HUMAN EVENTS is a reassuring experience which I anticipate each week."

leaders had been talking of simply concentrating on local and congressional elections, but they were snowed under by the rest of the oligarchy. In the last weeks of Truman's campaign, Jack Kroll joined the President on his train.

Today, only Modern Republicans fail to take this lesson from history and indulge in fantasies that they can corral labor union support. Many on Capitol Hill who had feared Nixon shared this delusion (after the steel settlement) were encouraged to hear that he viewed labor's role in the upcoming campaign realistically, that he did not expect to get the support of the steel union leadership. In a speech in Florida on January 16, Nixon said: "Mr. McDonald [president of the USW] is a Democrat. I expect him to support the Democratic nominee."

A Call for Nuclear Tests: In the wake of Ike's refusal to extend an agreement with the Russians to ban atomic tests, and with the Russians reportedly testing rockets in the Pacific, Senator John Marshall Butler (R.-Md.) has strongly come out for a return to underground testing.

Although Hubert Humphrey (D.-Minn.) has declared we are ahead of the Russians on atomic weapons and that the renewal might start an arms race, others like Butler on Capitol Hill look at it differently.

They note that the leading "liberal" Democrats continue to say we're not spending enough on defense, while at the same time calling for an end to atomic testing which is needed to improve our weapons.

The testing, moreover, is needed to find ways to reduce the atomic fallout (a favorite nightmare of the "liberals") in case of a war. This fact was brought out by a former member of the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. Willard Libby, before the Subcommittee on Disarmament in 1958, of which Humphrey was then chairman.

In a letter to Humphrey, appearing in the appendix of the March 6, 1958, hearings, Libby said testing is needed to produce "clean" weapons. Libby went on to say that "it is my deep conviction that we must have clean weapons in all yield ranges available in our stockpile in large numbers. If not, all humanity will surely suffer to some extent if a major nuclear war occurs."

Senator Butler points out that testing is also needed because one can't depend on the Russians to abandon underground tests, which most scientists agree are almost impossible to detect. In fact, it was the Soviet's refusal to set up an inspection system to detect underground tests which caused Ike to announce he would not renew the test ban.

The difficulty of detecting these tests was also brought out by Dr. Libby before the subcommittee. He noted that when a small nuclear bomb was exploded 800 feet underground, "our Geiger counters showed no effects . . ."

Communist Party—USA: Federal Bureau of Investigation Director J. Edgar Hoover warns that a revitalized Communist party is on the move in this country. In a new report to the Senate Internal Security Sub-

committee, Hoover says that "the recent visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States has done much to create an atmosphere favorable to communism," and, he notes, the Communist party of the US has been quick to exploit "the current international climate in an effort to make Russian policies more acceptable to American public opinion."

Hoover credits Gus Hall, newly elected head of the Communist arm in the US, with welding his followers into "a hard-hitting, mobile weapon against the free American Government" at the party's recent 17th annual convention in the Harlem section of New York. The FBI head describes Hall as energetic, aggressive and dangerous and predicts that the American Communist party—under Hall's leadership—will be, as always, "an obedient slave of Moscow."

One of the strongest opponents of the Khrushchev visit when it was announced last summer was Senator Styles Bridges (R.-N. H.). Last week Senator Bridges recalled: "I said I feared it would have a softening effect on a certain element of our population and cause a lowering of our guard. Now, just a few months later, we find Mr. Hoover substantiating my fears."

Uninformed Voters: The results of an independent poll conducted for *Redbook* magazine (published in the January issue) show an appalling ignorance on the part of young voters about the leading Democratic Presidential hopefuls. The survey was made among 500 persons from all parts of the country, Republicans and Democrats alike, between the ages of 21 and 40.

Less than 50% knew the correct party affiliation of Humphrey and Symington. Less than 50% knew the home states of Kennedy, Johnson, Humphrey and Symington. Despite all the publicity about Kennedy's religious affiliation, more than 25% of those polled identified it incorrectly.

Surprisingly few of the young people questioned associated any of the Democratic candidates with great personal wealth of their own: Stevenson, 44%; Kennedy, 43%; Johnson, 11%; Symington, 9%. In response to a question on which of the candidates had suffered serious illness or injury in recent years, only 18% remembered Johnson's heart attack in 1955—only 7% recalled Kennedy's extended hospitalization in 1954-55.

Only 34% thought that Adlai Stevenson should be classified as a "liberal." And although Kennedy, Humphrey and Symington vote consistently right down the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) line, remarkably few of the persons polled considered them "liberal": Kennedy, 29%; Humphrey, 25%; Symington, 13%.

You can help educate the younger generation to the facts of political life by sending gift subscriptions of HUMAN EVENTS to them.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS TO HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks \$1. Yearly rate, \$11; 6 months, \$6; 3 months, \$3. By first class mail, \$13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$15 a year. For change of address send old address (EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). **ALLOW US 2 WEEKS** to process new subscriptions and changes of address. Bound Annual Volume with complete index, \$15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958 and 1959 volumes available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, Editor and Publisher JAMES L. WICK, Executive Publisher
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER
W. B. HICKS, JR., Business Manager FRANK CHODOROV, Contributing Editor

Article Section

Shameful Summit

The Story of Roosevelt at Yalta

By GEORGE N. CROCKER

Excerpted from a new book, Roosevelt's Road to Russia, by George N. Crocker, former law school dean (Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, \$5)

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT's fourth inauguration was held on January 20, 1945. Three days later, he boarded the cruiser *Quincy*. For several months his fondest dream, next to his re-election, had been another love feast with "Uncle Joe" Stalin. ("I like this man," he had told Frances Perkins, "and I want to keep on good terms with him.") But now the Russian dictator had made it plain that if the President of the United States wanted to see him, he would have to trek to Russia.

All of the President's advisors except Harry Hopkins opposed his going. Cocksure, ill-prepared, and, as at Teheran, with no strategy beyond his old obsession that the important thing was for Stalin to "like" him, he ignored them and went across the world in an ostentatious spectacle of personal vanity and power which was to be his last. The Yalta Conference was held in February. On April 12, Roosevelt died.

Just before he left for Yalta, he received some momentous news at the White House. Secretary of War Stimson and General Leslie R. Groves, director of the Manhattan Project, which was developing the first atomic bomb, informed him that the success of the A-bomb was "a 99 per cent certainty" and that it "would probably be ready in August."

This could have dissipated any lingering doubts that the United States, unaided, and without storming the Japanese homeland, would be able to blast Japan out of the war. But already there were no doubts in the minds of those best able to know, and Mr. Roosevelt knew this.

The previous July he had gone to Honolulu. There, General Douglas MacArthur and Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, commander of the naval forces in the Pacific, had told him, in the presence of Admiral William D. Leahy, that "Japan could be forced to accept our terms of surrender by the use of sea and air power without an invasion of the Japanese homeland." Since then, what was left of the Japanese fleet had been crushed in the Battle

of the Leyte Gulf in October, the Philippines had been retaken, B-29's were bombing Japan from Guam, Tinian, and Saipan, and Japanese peace feelers had been put out.

When Roosevelt went to Yalta, he kept MacArthur and Nimitz far away. He asked them nothing, told them nothing; yet they were the two men most qualified to counsel him on the Pacific war. The neglect would be incomprehensible but for the fact that he already knew what their advice would be and it was not compatible with his plans. At this stage elementary statesmanship, for the security of American interests in the Far East, required that the Soviet Union be, at almost any cost, dissuaded and forestalled from entering the war with Japan. Roosevelt went to Yalta and secretly did just the opposite.

WOODROW WILSON may have been naive at Versailles after World War I, but he was a meticulous scholar and was never casual. Roosevelt approached Yalta as if he were on a vacation. In fact, Harry Hopkins' notes frankly say: "I was sure the President would wind up by going to the Crimea, the primary reason being that it was a part of the world he had never visited and his adventurous spirit was forever leading him to go to unusual places and, on his part, the election being over, he would no longer be disturbed about it for political reasons."

Roosevelt's health was obviously deteriorating. ("His face had a transparency . . . and often there was a far-away look in his eyes . . . I felt that he had a slender contact with life," Churchill writes.) But the malodorous decisions finalized at Yalta—for slave labor, forcible repatriation of refugees, the uprooting of millions of human beings in Europe from their homes and lands, the breaking of pledges of the right of self-determination, and similar brutalities—which have made Yalta a symbol of international turpitude cannot be blamed on the President's illness.

The plain fact is that Roosevelt had succumbed to Stalin's wiles back at Tcheran in December,

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

1943. There the two—often over Churchill's objections—had stacked the deck with which the game was played out at Yalta, but the deck had been hidden away until after the fourth term election of November, 1944.

The *Quincy* took the President to Malta, where he joined Churchill. Transport planes wafted them and their entourages of some seven hundred people across the Aegean and Turkey and the Black Sea to the Crimea. Roosevelt flew in his luxurious new four-engine plane, the *Sacred Cow*, which was equipped with elevators.

This, indeed, was the purple path of adventure. President Roosevelt and his retinue were domiciled in Livadia Palace, built as the summer home of Nicholas II. The British were housed in Vorontsov Villa, twelve miles away, and the Russians, cleverly, occupied the Yusupov Palace, midway between.

THE SOVIET SECRET POLICE were everywhere and were under the personal command of the notorious Commissar L. P. Beria, who was destined to be denounced as a monster and executed after Stalin's death. Beria's duties at Yalta were, no doubt, exacting, but not unpleasant. For example, he had the opportunity to jolly up with Roosevelt, his daughter, Mrs. Anna Boettiger, Secretary of State Stettinius, and the others at a dinner at the Russian headquarters, which included twenty courses and forty-five toasts. Also draining vodka at this wassail were Andrei Y. Vishinsky, the grisly public prosecutor at the liquidation purge trials Stalin had staged from 1935 to 1939, and V. M. Molotov, who in August of 1939 had contrived with Hitler's von Ribbentrop the unholy pact which signalled the start of World War II. Such a feeling of fraternity welled up in Mr. Roosevelt, in the company of Marshal Stalin and Messrs. Beria, Vishinsky, and Molotov, that he offered a particularly saccharine toast in which he observed that the atmosphere at the dinner was "that of a family."

Alger Hiss was brought to Yalta as an "expert" from the State Department. His influence there should not be magnified. However, James F. Byrnes saw him "frequently consulted by Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Stettinius" in the conference room, and Hiss himself later testified before a Congressional committee that "I helped formulate the Yalta agreement to some extent." Indeed he did. Some of his handwritten notes went back and forth between President Roosevelt and himself. At the plenary sessions, the three heads of state and the senior officials sat at a great round table. Where was Alger Hiss? He sat with Harry Hopkins behind the President.

Yalta was, of course, Stalin's show. He was the star. At the conference table, he was at once the most blunt and the most subtle. As a host, he overwhelmed his impressionable guests with lavish care, so that Churchill telegraphed home that the Russians' "prodigality exceeds belief." On one occasion somebody said casually that there was no lemon peel in the cocktails. The next day, a lemon tree, loaded with fruit, was in the hall, brought from far away by air.

Mesmerized from the start, Roosevelt presented a spectacle that can only be described as pitiful—this fading President, floating slowly out of this life, outmatched and outwitted at every point, mouthing meaningless cliches, and dripping with flummery in the presence of the dictator.

How did the host of Yalta look in the flesh? "He has got an unpleasantly cold, crafty, cruel face," wrote Alanbrooke in his diary, "and whenever I look at him I can imagine his sending off people to their doom without turning a hair. On the other hand, there is no doubt he has a quick brain."

Sly and disarming, Stalin was an expert at the Communists' forensic device of giving special emphasis to an assertion of which the exact opposite was the real truth. "I am talking as an old man; that is why I am talking so much," he said at a dinner at the Yusupov Palace on February 8. "But I want to drink to our alliance . . . In the history of diplomacy I know of no such close alliance . . . In an alliance the allies should not deceive each other. Perhaps this is naive? Experienced diplomats may say, 'Why should I not deceive my ally?' But I as a naive man think it is best not to deceive my ally even if he is a fool." Yet no man at the table could have doubted that Stalin would make an alliance with the Devil, or with angels, if it would be to his advantage, or break it whenever it suited him.

AT THE END of the eight day conference, a public communique and secret agreements were signed. Poland was to be dismembered. Some eleven million people who lived in the eastern half of prewar Poland were to be surrendered to the Soviet Union without any semblance of a plebiscite. Thus, Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill decreed Soviet annexation of forty-eight per cent of Poland's territory and about one-third of her population. No Pole was present.

The Polish government-in-exile, under which whole regiments of Poles were fighting valiantly for the Western powers in Italy and on the western front, was now betrayed, and the Lublin Committee, a

group of Polish Communists trained for years in Moscow in Stalin's tough school, was described in the communique as "the present Provisional Government of Poland." This meant the surrender of Poland to communism.

For four days Churchill fought against this faithlessness, but his American colleague would not stand fast with him. Sharp differences between Churchill and Stalin came to the surface the first day this subject was discussed. That evening, the President made a fatal move. He compromised his independence by sending a letter to Stalin in which he announced: "I am determined there shall be no breach between ourselves and the Soviet Union." With that statement he admitted that if Stalin made an issue of Poland, the United States would give way. Thus fortified, Stalin tossed the Prime Minister and the President only some high-sounding words to take home, about "free elections." Admiral Leahy quickly recognized the loosely-worded formula as a "phony," and spoke up before it was signed. "Mr. President," said Leahy, "this is so elastic that the Russians can stretch it all the way from Yalta to Washington without ever breaking it." Roosevelt said he knew that.

A huge chunk of Germany was to be torn off and given to Poland as a sop for the mayhem to be performed on that unhappy country; some choice morsels, such as the ancient Germanic city of Königsberg, were to be donated to the Soviet Union outright; the rest of eastern Germany was to be spread-eagled for forced Communization by Russian masters, since occupation by the Red Army meant nothing less than that; and the fate of Berlin was left in a fog. How and when this nightmare would ever end was too unpleasant a subject to be faced at Yalta.

Ten million Germans were doomed to be turned out of their homes and set adrift on the roads to flee westward, for all the territories to be detached were ethnically German. What followed Yalta was a mass expulsion which Churchill himself was impelled to allude to as "tragedy on a prodigious scale." Actually, never in history, even in the worst of pagan times, has there been such a millionfold uprooting of human beings, and Churchill admitted in the House of Commons in August of 1945 that it was "not a good augury for the future of Europe." The Atlantic Charter, at the beginning of the war, had pledged against "territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned," but at Teheran and Yalta this pledge had been torn to shreds.

ROOSEVELT HAD ALWAYS taken pains to pose as a humanitarian, so it is not surprising that the agreement for forced human labor was kept out of the public communique and put into the secret protocol. That relapse into barbarism of past ages was hidden even from James F. Byrnes, a member of the American delegation. "Had I known it," he writes, "I would have urged the President to oppose the inclusion in the protocol of any provision for the use of large groups of human beings as enforced or slave laborers."

Another dark moral blot upon the Yalta record was the promise to Stalin that the Russian nationals rounded up by the Americans and British in Germany, France and Italy would be deported to Russia, by force if necessary. There were about two million of these. Some had been captured by the Germans; others had voluntarily fled from communism early in the war. Many were found in German uniforms, but others were civilian escapees who only wanted to find freedom. Most of them begged not to be sent back to Russia, knowing their fate would be the firing squad or Siberian slave camps.

The State Department had decided to disallow forcible repatriation and abide by the Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners of war, but a message was dispatched to Washington from Yalta overruling this decision. As a consequence, when the war ended a sickening drama was enacted. All the Russians were herded indiscriminately—screaming, in tears, at bayonet point or dragged bodily—into boxcars and sent to Russia. Not the slightest attention was paid to the Geneva Convention, the doctrine of asylum, or the humane regard for individual choice which had ameliorated man's cruelty in less barbarous years. The gruesome spectacle was singed in many memories, but not until ten years later, when the State Department published the so-called "Yalta Papers," was it known for sure that this unholy crime against humanity had been connived at Yalta.

After lunch on the afternoon of February 8, Stalin and Roosevelt, like two arch conspirators slinking off to hatch the direst plot of all, vanished behind the locked doors of a room in Livadia Palace. At the President's request, Churchill was not there. In this room, Stalin was bribed, with Japanese and Chinese territory and concessions and vast stores of American equipment, to enter the war against Japan "two or three months after Germany has surrendered."

This is one agreement which was never broken. The Soviet Union entered the Pacific war six days before Japan surrendered and two days after the

atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima. Her contribution to Japan's defeat was nil, but she walked off with spoils of victory of incalculable value. It is this secret deal that General Patrick J. Hurley, Roosevelt's Ambassador to China, characterized, after he learned of it, as a "blueprint for Communist conquest of China," and that William C. Bullitt, who had served by appointment of Roosevelt himself as Ambassador to Russia and to France, called "entirely dishonorable" and "potentially disastrous to the United States." Bullitt has written: "No more unnecessary, disgraceful and potentially dangerous document has ever been signed by a President of the United States."

The evidence is overwhelming, from many sources. Roosevelt's generosity to Stalin that afternoon in Livadia Palace was a willful caprice of his own. There was no force majeure pressing on him. He faced no Hobson's choice. He should have spurned what he was bargaining for even if it had been tendered as a gift. The Russophilism which possessed his mind at this time blinded him to all other considerations. The claim that he acted under military advice has always been a sham.

James F. Byrnes was kept in the dark about this agreement, too. Roosevelt did not tell him about it at Yalta, nor when they were back in Washington. "When the President returned," Byrnes attests, "he did not mention it to me and the protocol was kept locked in his safe at the White House." It was not until some time after Roosevelt's death that the safe in the White House yielded the astonishing document, to the surprise of the new President.

YALTA WAS, OF COURSE, more than the unhappy culmination of Roosevelt's long series of blunders in *Weltpolitik*. It was a moral debacle of unimaginable evil to the world. But from a power standpoint alone, it climaxed the pattern of action which made the Soviet Union the dominant power on the Eurasian land-mass, a result which, according to documentary evidence, Roosevelt and Hopkins had anticipated with equanimity at least as far back as the Quebec Conference of August, 1943, and to which they had given persistent support. In these days, Winston Churchill, according to his own words, moved about "with an aching heart and a mind oppressed by forebodings." When we cast the light into the dark recesses of the summit conferences of World War II, we find that Churchill's strategy for the war and the peace was repeatedly thwarted by Franklin D. Roosevelt in favor of Stalin's desires.

What did Roosevelt tell the American people when he came home from Yalta? In a carefully

staged performance, he addressed a joint session of Congress sitting in a wheel chair. "This Conference concerned itself only with the European war and the political problems of Europe, and not with the Pacific war," he swore. This was, of course, a falsehood, for he had in his safe the secret agreement signed at Yalta concerning the Pacific war. He had, it is true, promised Stalin to keep the secret, but had he also promised to perjure himself before the Congress of the United States?

Then came the glittering words: "The Crimea Conference . . . spells—and it ought to spell—the end of the system of unilateral action, exclusive alliances, and spheres of influence, and balances of power I am sure that—under the agreement reached at Yalta—there will be a more stable political Europe than ever before."

This may well rank as the most blustering, the most reckless—and the most wrong—prediction ever made within the walls of the National Capitol.

By this time, American public opinion was so drugged by wartime propaganda that it was possible for the President to make such a statement and be believed by millions. There were voices of dissent, too, and widespread uneasiness in the country, but people believed because they had made great sacrifices for—they hoped—something, and they desperately wanted to believe. Optimism had always gushed from the summit conferences—from the Atlantic Conference, from Casablanca, Quebec, Cairo, Teheran, and now from Yalta, the end of Roosevelt's road to Russia. People had been lavish in their hope and trust. But for decades they and their children were to pay for the folly.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. \$11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for \$1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "SHAMEFUL SUMMIT" at \$ _____

☐ Payment enclosed

☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins not stamps); 10 copies \$1; 25 copies \$2; 100 copies \$5; 500 copies \$20; 1,000 copies \$30. In 5,000 lots \$25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles, add 1c per copy; for airmail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for \$1 ☐ 1 year for \$11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____